

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to air an anti-Kerry documentary just days before the presidential election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. Because it uses the public airwaves -- my airwaves -- free of charge, Sinclair is obligated by law to serve the public interest. However, it is clear that they are more interested in bolstering their bottom line than serving the public interest by trying to sway the election in favor of an administration that backs policies which will allow large media companies like Sinclair to grow even bigger.

When local television stations are owned by huge national corporations, we get less genuine local opinions and viewpoints, and more commentary produced in Sinclair's "News Central" in suburban Maryland that is designed to push Sinclair's agenda, not to serve democracy. I want to see more people like those in my own community on my local broadcast station and more substantive news that helps me make opinions about important issues. Sinclair is clearly not interested in providing this.

Sinclair's actions are a disgrace. They show what can happen when one huge corporation controls too much of what we see and hear. They show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. Thank you.